

1 Leon Dayan, SBN 153162
2 Abigail V. Carter*
3 Ramya Ravindran*
4 Lane M. Shadgett*
5 J. Alexander Rowell*
BREDHOFF & KAISER P.L.L.C.
6 805 Fifteenth Street NW, Suite 1000
7 Washington, D.C. 20005
8 Tel. (202) 842-2600
9 Fax (202) 842-1888
10 ldayan@bredhoff.com
11 acarter@bredhoff.com
12 rravindran@bredhoff.com
13 lshadgett@bredhoff.com
14 arowell@bredhoff.com
15 *Admitted *pro hac vice*

16 Daniel Feinberg, SBN 135983
17 Catha Worthman, SBN 230399
FEINBERG, JACKSON, WORTHMAN
18 **& WASOW, LLP**
19 2030 Addison Street, Suite 500
20 Berkeley, CA 94704
21 Tel. (510) 269-7998
22 Fax (510) 269-7994
23 dan@feinbergjackson.com
24 catha@feinbergjackson.com

25 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs* (Additional Counsel listed in signature block)

26 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

27 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

28 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

29 AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
30 GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO, *et al.*,

Case No. 3:25-cv-03070-JD

31 Plaintiffs,

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF ASKING
COURT TO SET A STATUS
CONFERENCE**

32 v.

33 DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as
34 President of the United States, *et al.*,

35 Defendants.

1 Plaintiffs American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, *et al.*, hereby
 2 respectfully submit this Motion for Administrative Relief, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11,
 3 asking this Court to set a status conference for the purposes of entering a schedule pursuant to
 4 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16, to move this case forward expeditiously to final judgment.

5 In support of their request, Plaintiffs provide the following showing of good cause.

6 1. On June 24, 2025, finding that Plaintiffs had “demonstrated a serious question as
 7 to whether their First Amendment rights have been violated,” ECF No. 60, at 17, this Court granted
 8 Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction to “preserve the status quo until trial,” *id.* at 3, and
 9 “resolution of the merits of [Plaintiffs’] claims on a fully developed record,” *id.* at 2. Because the
 10 Court determined that Plaintiffs had “demonstrated a serious question under the First Amendment
 11 that warrants preserving the status quo pending further litigation,” it did “not take up plaintiffs’
 12 other claims as a potential ground for an injunction.” *Id.* at 22. The Court therefore did not address
 13 Plaintiff’s claims of viewpoint discrimination under the First Amendment, ultra vires action by the
 14 President, or deprivations of due process and equal protection under the Fifth Amendment. *See id.*
 15 at 13.

16 2. Simultaneously with granting the motion for a preliminary injunction, the Court
 17 stated that “[a]n expedited trial date will be set in a separate order.” *Id.* at 3. The Court set a case
 18 management conference for July 17, 2025, and ordered the parties to file a joint case management
 19 statement by July 10, 2025. *Id.* at 29. The Court ordered that the “case management statement
 20 should contain an expedited proposed schedule and trial date.” *Id.*

21 3. In accordance with the Court’s order, on July 10, 2025, the parties jointly filed a
 22 case management statement. ECF No. 69.

23 4. In the meantime, Defendants filed a notice of appeal from the order granting a
 24 preliminary injunction and filed motions in this Court and in the Ninth Circuit for a stay of the
 25 preliminary injunction pending that appeal. The Ninth Circuit issued an administrative stay on July
 26 7, 2025, and scheduled oral argument on Defendants’ motion for a stay pending appeal for July
 27 17, 2025.

28 5. On July 15, 2025, “in light of the ongoing appellate proceeding,” this Court vacated

1 the case management conference set for July 17, 2025.

2 6. On August 1, 2025, the Ninth Circuit issued an opinion granting Defendants'
 3 request for a stay of the injunctive relief. Order, *AFGE v. Trump*, No. 25-4014 (9th Cir. Aug. 1,
 4 2025), ECF No. 32.1.

5 7. An expedited trial date is warranted and necessary despite the pendency of
 6 Defendants' appeal from this Court's preliminary injunction. A ruling on a preliminary injunction
 7 and an appeal from that ruling "ordinarily does not obviate the need to proceed with preparation
 8 for trial and trial." *Big Country Foods, Inc. v. Bd. of Educ. of Anchorage Sch. Dist.*, 868 F.2d 1085,
 9 1087 (9th Cir. 1989). A decision resolving a preliminary-injunction appeal "will affect the rights
 10 of the parties only until the district court renders judgment on the merits of the case, at which time
 11 the losing party may again appeal." *Sports Form, Inc. v. United Press Int'l, Inc.*, 686 F.2d 750,
 12 753 (9th Cir. 1982). In many if not most instances, a case can "proceed[] to a disposition on the
 13 merits in far less time than it [takes] to process [an] appeal." *Id.* As a result, "in many cases, appeal
 14 of district courts' preliminary injunctions will result in unnecessary delay to the parties and
 15 inefficient use of judicial resources." *Id.*; see *Big Country Foods, Inc.*, 868 F.2d at 1087 ("An
 16 appeal of the district court's decision on a motion for a preliminary injunction often will result in
 17 unnecessary delay to the parties and inefficient use of judicial resources."). Indeed, the Ninth
 18 Circuit has "applaud[ed]" district courts that have "moved with appropriate speed towards a final
 19 disposition" after entering a preliminary injunction and has directed district courts "to proceed to
 20 trial and otherwise move towards a final judgment . . . without waiting for . . . interlocutory review"
 21 on appeal. *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990, 1002-03 (9th Cir. 2012). These considerations
 22 weigh strongly in favor of moving expeditiously to final judgment despite the pending appeal of
 23 the preliminary injunction.¹

24 8. Moreover, it is imperative that Plaintiffs' lawsuit move expeditiously to final
 25 judgment on all claims raised by Plaintiffs on a fully developed record. As this Court concluded,
 26 in the absence of a preliminary injunction maintaining the status quo, Plaintiffs face grave threats
 27

28 ¹ In the preliminary-injunction appeal pending in the Ninth Circuit, Plaintiffs' response brief is due on August 22, 2025; Defendants' reply is due on September 12, 2025; and no oral argument has been scheduled.

1 to their existence and their collective bargaining rights. Those injuries remain ongoing and, indeed,
 2 are increasing in severity. Although the Ninth Circuit, in balancing the equities, stated that
 3 “[w]hatever harm to collective bargaining rights that Plaintiffs will experience due to a stay is
 4 mitigated by the direction to agencies to refrain from terminating collective bargaining agreements
 5 until litigation has concluded,” Defendants are treating the Ninth Circuit’s stay determination as a
 6 license to terminate collective bargaining agreements. On August 6, 2025, the Department of
 7 Veterans Affairs—which employs approximately 467,000 employees, of which approximately
 8 422,000 were in bargaining units previously represented by Plaintiffs—“announced the
 9 termination of collective bargaining agreements for most VA bargaining-unit employees.” VA
 10 Terminates Union Contracts For Most Bargaining-Unit Employees, <https://news.va.gov/press-room/va-terminates-union-contracts-for-most-bargaining-unit-employees/> (Aug. 6, 2025, press
 11 release); *see* Chris Cameron, *Trump Administration Begins to Strip Federal Workers of Union
 12 Protections*, N.Y. Times (Aug. 6, 2025). On August 8, 2025, the Environmental Protection Agency
 13 informed workers that it had terminated collective bargaining agreements with Plaintiffs AFGE
 14 and NAGE. *See* Erich Wagner, *EPA Becomes the Second Federal Agency to Cancel its Union
 15 Contracts*, Gov’t Exec. (Aug. 11, 2025), <https://www.govexec.com/workforce/2025/08/epa-becomes-second-federal-agency-cancel-its-union-contracts/407364/>. On August 12, 2025, the
 16 Department of Agriculture informed union leaders at the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service
 17 that it had terminated collective bargaining agreements with Plaintiff NFFE. Leah Douglas,
 18 Reuters, *USDA moves to End Employee Union Contracts, Documents Show*, U.S. News & World
 19 Report (Aug. 13, 2025), <https://www.usnews.com/news/politics/articles/2025-08-13/usda-moves-to-end-some-employee-union-contracts-documents-show>. Proceeding to final judgment in this
 20 matter is of critical importance to Plaintiffs.

21 9. Plaintiffs contacted Defendants about the relief sought in this Motion and asked if
 22 they would join in a stipulated request to the Court. Defendants declined to join in such a request,
 23 necessitating this Motion.

24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 On the basis of the foregoing showing of good cause, Plaintiffs respectfully request this
2 Court set a scheduling conference for the purposes of setting a discovery and briefing schedule
3 and trial date to move this case expeditiously to final judgment.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 DATED: August 14, 2025

3 Daniel Feinberg, SBN 135983
4 Catha Worthman, SBN 230399
5 Anne Weis, SBN 336480
6 FEINBERG, JACKSON, WORTHRMAN
7 & WASOW, LLP
8 2030 Addison Street, Suite 500
9 Berkeley, CA 94704
10 Tel. (510) 269-7998
11 Fax (510) 269-7994
12 dan@feinbergjackson.com
13 catha@feinbergjackson.com
14 anne@feinbergjackson.com

15 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

16 Rushab B. Sanghvi (SBN 302809)
17 Andres M. Grajales*
18 American Federation of Government
19 Employees, AFL-CIO
20 80 F Street NW
21 Washington, D.C. 20001
22 Tel: (202) 639-6426
23 SanghR@afge.org
24 Grajaa@afge.org
25 *Pro hac vice

26 *Counsel for Plaintiff American Federation
27 of Government Employees (AFGE)*

28 Nicole Daro (SBN 276948)
National Nurses United
155 Grand Ave.
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel: (510) 207-8291
ndaro@calnurses.org

17 *Counsel for Plaintiff NNOC/NNU*

18 Sarah E. Suszczyk*
19 National Association of
20 Government Employees, Inc.
21 159 Thomas Burgin Parkway
22 Quincy, MA 02169
23 Tel: (617) 376-7239
24 ssuszczky@nage.org
25 *Pro hac vice

26 *Counsel For Plaintiff National Association
27 of Government Employees (NAGE)*

/s/ *Abigail V. Carter*

Leon Dayan (SBN 153162)
Abigail V. Carter*
Ramya Ravindran*
Lane M. Shadgett*
J. Alexander Rowell*
BREDHOFF & KAISER P.L.L.C.
805 Fifteenth Street NW, Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 842-2600
Fax: (202) 842-1888
ldayan@bredhoff.com
acarter@bredhoff.com
rravindran@bredhoff.com
lshadgett@bredhoff.com
arowell@bredhoff.com

**Pro hac vice*

Counsel for Plaintiffs

Teague P. Paterson (SBN 226659)
Matthew S. Blumin*
American Federation of State, County, and
Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO
1625 L Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 775-5900
Fax: (202) 452-0556
tpaterson@afscme.org
mblumin@afscme.org

**Pro hac vice*

*Counsel for Plaintiff American Federation of
State County and Municipal Employees, AFL-
CIO (AFSCME)*

Steven K. Ury (SBN 199499)
Service Employees International Union, AFL-
CIO
1800 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 730-7428
steven.ury@seiu.org

*Counsel for Plaintiff Service Employees
International Union, AFL-CIO (SEIU)*

1 Yvette M. Piacsek*
2 General Counsel
3 National Federation of Federal Employees,
4 IAM, AFL-CIO
5 1225 New York Avenue NW, Suite 450
6 Washington, D.C. 20005
7 Tel: (202) 216-4428
8 ypiacsek@nffe.org
9 **Pro hac vice*

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

6 *Counsel for Plaintiff National Federation of*
7 *Federal Employees, IAM, AFL-CIO (NFFE)*